



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/247,502 | 02/10/1999 | CARY LEE BATES | IBM/72 | 7707 |

7590 06/22/2004
SCOTT A STINEBRUNER
WOOD HERRON & EVANS
2700 CAREW TOWER
441 VINE STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 452022917

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2143

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SR

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/247,502

Applicant(s)

BATES ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 9, 11 - 22 and 25 - 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 9, 11 - 22 and 25 - 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 9, 11 – 22 and 25 – 36 are presented for examination.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The limitation of claim 19 states, “wherein notifying the first user of the association of the second hypertext document with the second user includes displaying the list of favorite links to the first user, and wherein the method further comprising building a list of favorite links associated with the hypertext document being viewed by the first user by combining lists of favorite links associated with only those users currently viewing the same hypertext document as the first user,” is unique and different from the prior art that was previously stated.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 32 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2143

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5 – 8, 13 – 18, 20 – 22, 25 – 31 and 33 – 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacNaughton et al. (6020884) (hereinafter MacNaughton) in view of Suzuki et al. (6240443) (hereinafter Suzuki) in further view of Abraham et al. (5983270) (hereinafter Abraham).

5. As per claim 1, MacNaughton teaches a method of providing access to hypertext documents in a multi-user computer environment, the method comprising:

6. (a) tracking accesses to a plurality of preexisting hypertext documents by a plurality of users, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57);

7. (b) notifying a first user that is currently accessing one of the plurality of preexisting hypertext documents of the identity of a second user that is accessing the same hypertext document, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57); but does not specifically teach a user-editable list; and

8. (c) maintaining on behalf of the first user a user-editable saved user list that identifies at least the second user such that the first user is notified of the identity of any user in the user-editable saved user list that is accessing the same hypertext document, wherein maintaining the user-editable saved user list includes at least one of adding a third user to the user-editable saved user list and removing the second user from the user-editable saved user list in response to user input received from the first user. Suzuki teaches maintaining on behalf of the first user a saved user list that identifies at least the

Art Unit: 2143

second user such that the first user is notified of the identity of any user in the saved user list that is accessing the same hypertext document, wherein maintaining the saved user list includes at least one of adding a third user to the saved user list and removing the second user from the saved user list in response to user input received from the first user, (e.g. col. 7, lines 14 – 42 & col. 9, lines 64 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Suzuki with MacNaughton because it would be more efficient if the first user could edit their list so to add new users that could contribute to his internet activities, i.e. new friend to chat with, and to get delete users that are no longer using the same system as the first user, therefore, aiding in keeping an updated list. Abraham teaches a user-editable list, (e.g. col. 10, lines 30 – 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abraham with the combine system of MacNaughton and Suzuki because it would make the users list more dynamic and give the user more control as to who they would want on their list or access to private hypertext documents (i.e. chat rooms), like friends, relatives, etc.

9. As per claim 2, MacNaughton teaches tracking accesses to the plurality of preexisting hypertext document includes maintaining a list of users that access each hypertext document, and wherein notifying the first user includes notifying the first user of the identity of each user in the list of users, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

10. As per claim 5, MacNaughton teaches tracking accesses to the hypertext document further includes removing from the list of users a user that is no longer accessing the hypertext document, (e.g. col. 9, lines 5 – 24).

11. As per claim 6, MacNaughton teaches wherein the second user has a home hypertext document associated therewith, the method further comprising communicating to the first user a copy of the home hypertext document associated with the second user in response to user input from the first user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

12. As per claim 7, MacNaughton teaches a method of providing access to hypertext documents in a multi-user computer environment, the method comprising:

13. (a) tracking accesses to a plurality of preexisting hypertext documents by a plurality of users, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57);

14. (b) notifying a first user that is currently accessing one of the plurality of preexisting hypertext documents of the identity of a second user that is accessing the same hypertext document, wherein the second user is identified in a saved user list for the first user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57); but does not specifically teach a user-editable list;

15. (c) notifying the first user of the location of another hypertext document currently being viewed by a third user, wherein the third user is identified in the user-editable saved user list for the first user; and

16. (d) managing the user-editable saved user list for the first user in response to user input from the first user, including at least one of adding and removing users to and from the user-editable saved user list. Suzuki teaches notifying the first user of the location of another hypertext document currently being viewed by a third user, wherein the third user

Art Unit: 2143

is identified in the saved user list for the first user, (e.g. col. 9, line 23 – col. 10, line 34);
and

17. (d) managing the saved user list for the first user in response to user input from the first user, including at least one of adding and removing users to and from the saved user list, (e.g. col. 9, line 23 – col. 10, line 34). Abraham teaches a user-editable list, (e.g. col. 10, lines 30 – 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Suzuki and Abraham with MacNaughton because of similar reasons stated above. Furthermore, if the first user desired to change users to communicate with and/or view a different topic that interests the first user it would be more convenient to be able to view other users that would be in different hypertext documents.

18. As per claim 8, MacNaughton teaches communicating to the first user a copy of the hypertext document currently being viewed by the third user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

19. As per claim 13, MacNaughton teaches wherein notifying the first user of the identity of the second user includes notifying the first user of whether the second user is currently active in the multi-user computer environment, (e.g. col. 21, lines 4 – 24).

20. As per claim 14, MacNaughton teaches performing a predetermined list management operation on the user list in response to user input from the first user, the predetermined list management operation selected from the group consisting of sending a message to a user in the user list, navigating to a hypertext document currently being

Art Unit: 2143

viewed by a user from the user list, and navigating to a home hypertext document for a user from the user list, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 52).

21. As per claim 15, MacNaughton teaches

22. (a) associating a second hypertext document with the second user in response to user input from the second user, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 52); and

23. (b) notifying the first user of the association of the second hypertext document with the second user, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 52).

24. As per claim 16, MacNaughton teaches communicating the second hypertext document to the first user in response to user input from the first user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

25. As per claim 17, MacNaughton teaches associating the second hypertext document with the second user includes storing an identifier for the second hypertext document in a list of favorite links associated with the second user, and wherein notifying the first user of the association of the second hypertext document with the second user includes displaying the list of favorite links to the first user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

26. As per claim 18, MacNaughton teaches displaying the list of favorite links is performed responsive to user input received from the first user while the first and second

Art Unit: 2143

users are currently viewing the same hypertext document, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

27. As per claim 20, MacNaughton teaches

28. (a) associating a second hypertext document with a first hypertext document in response to user input from the second user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57); and

29. (b) notifying the first user of the association of the second hypertext document with the first hypertext document, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

30. As per claim 21, MacNaughton teaches associating the second hypertext document with the first hypertext document includes temporarily associating the second hypertext document with the first hypertext document such that the association therebetween is discarded whenever the second user is not active in the multi-user computer environment, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

31. As per claim 22, MacNaughton teaches tracking accesses to the plurality of preexisting hypertext documents is performed in a first computer, and wherein at least a portion of the plurality of preexisting hypertext documents are stored externally from the multi-user computer environment, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

32. As per claim 25, MacNaughton teaches an apparatus, comprising:

33. a memory, (e.g. col. 21, lines 10 – 25); and

Art Unit: 2143

34. a program, resident in the memory, the program configured to track accesses to a plurality of preexisting documents by a plurality of users, to notify a first user among the plurality of users that is currently accessing one of the plurality of preexisting hypertext documents of the identity of a second user among the plurality of users that is accessing the same hypertext document(e.g. col. 6, lines 1 – 12), and to maintain on behalf of the first user a saved user list that identifies at least the second user such that the first user is notified of the identify of any user in the saved user list that is accessing the same hypertext document, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57 & col. 9, line 53 – col. 10, line 35), but does not specifically teach a user-editable list;

35. wherein the program is configured to maintain the user-editable saved user list by performing at least one of adding a third user to the user-editable saved user list and removing the second user from the user-editable saved user list in response to user input received from the first user. Suzuki teaches wherein the program is configured to maintain the saved user list by performing at least one of adding a third user to the saved user list and removing the second user from the saved user list in response to user input received from the first user, (e.g. col. 7, lines 32 – 63 & col. 9, line 23 – col. 10, line 34). Abraham teaches a user-editable list, (e.g. col. 10, lines 30 – 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Suzuki and Abraham with MacNaughton because of similar reasons as stated above. Furthermore, it would be more efficient if the first user could edit their list so to add new users that could contribute to his internet activities, i.e. new friend to chat with, and to get delete users that are no longer using the same system as the first user, therefore, aiding in keeping an updated list.

Art Unit: 2143

36. As per claim 26, MacNaughton teaches the program is further configured to maintain a list of users that access each hypertext document, and to notify the first user of the identity of each user in the list of users, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

37. As per claim 27, MacNaughton teaches the second user has a home hypertext document associated therewith, the program further configured to communicate to the first user a copy of the home hypertext document associated with the second user in response to user input from the first user, (e.g. col. 8, line 58 – col. 9, line 52).

38. As per claim 28, MacNaughton teaches the program is further configured to retrieve a navigation history for the second user, the navigation history including a set of hypertext documents previously accessed by the second user, (e.g. col. 8, lines 10 – 57).

39. As per claim 29, MacNaughton teaches the memory is disposed in a server computer, the apparatus further comprising a client computer coupled to the server computer, (e.g. col. 21, line 52 – col. 22, line 14), the client computer including a second memory and a second program resident in the second memory, the second program configured to display a first hypertext document to the first user, the first hypertext document including a hypertext link to a second hypertext document that is in the navigation history for the second user, the second program further configured to display within the first hypertext document an indication that the second hypertext document is in the navigation history for the second user, (e.g. col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 27).

Art Unit: 2143

40. As per claim 30, MacNaughton teaches the program is further configured to associate a second hypertext document with the second user in response to user input from the second user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57); and to notify the first user of the association of the second hypertext document with the second user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

41. As per claim 31, MacNaughton teaches the program is further configured to store an identifier for the second hypertext document in a list of favorite links associated with the second user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

42. As per claim 33, MacNaughton teaches the program is further configured to associate a second hypertext document with a first hypertext document in response to user input from the second user, and to notify the first user of the association of the second hypertext document with the first hypertext document, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

43. As per claim 34, MacNaughton teaches the program is further configured to temporarily associate the second hypertext document with the first hypertext document such that the association therebetween is discarded whenever the second user is not active, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

44. As per claim 35, MacNaughton teaches further comprising a first computer within which the memory is disposed, wherein the program is configured to retrieve at least a

Art Unit: 2143

portion of the plurality of preexisting hypertext documents from a second computer remote from the first computer and external from the apparatus, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

45. As per claim 36, MacNaughton teaches the second computer is coupled to the first computer over the Internet, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57).

46. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacNaughton (6020884) in view of Suzuki (6240443) in further view of Abraham (5983270) in further view of, “Chat Comp: Lobby”, Yahoo!, <http://chat.yahoo.com>, downloaded 11/18/98, (hereinafter Yahoo).

47. As per claim 3, MacNaughton, Suzuki and Abraham do not specifically teach notifying the first user of the identity of each user in the list of users includes displaying the list of users to the first user. Yahoo teaches notifying the first user of the identity of each user in the list of users includes displaying the list of users to the first user, (Yahoo page 2). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Yahoo with the combine system of MacNaughton, Suzuki and Abraham because it is easier and more pleasing to the eye to see a user on a list on a Web page then in a database.

48. As per claim 4, MacNaughton, Suzuki and Abraham do not teach notifying the first user of the identity of each user in the list of users includes separately notifying the

Art Unit: 2143

first user of each user from the list of users that is no longer accessing the hypertext document. Yahoo page 1 and Yahoo page 2 teaches notifying the first user of the identity of each user in the list of users includes separately notifying the first user of each user from the list of users that is no longer accessing the hypertext document. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Yahoo with the combine system of MacNaughton, Suzuki and Abraham because the first user would not have to search for a user to find out if the second user is accessing the hypertext document. The first user would only need to look at the updated list.

49. Claims 9, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacNaughton (6020884) in view of Kavner (6366947).

50. As per claim 9, MacNaughton teaches a method of providing access to hypertext documents in a multi-user computer environment, the method comprising:

51. (a) tracking accesses to a plurality of preexisting hypertext documents by a plurality of users, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57);

52. (b) notifying a first user that is currently accessing one of the plurality of preexisting hypertext documents of the identity of a second user that is accessing the same hypertext document, (e.g. col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 57),

53. wherein tracking accesses to the hypertext document further includes maintaining a table for the second user, the table including a set of hypertext documents previously accessed by the second user, and wherein the method further comprises notifying the first user of the set of hypertext documents in the table for the second user, (e.g. col. 7, line 57

Art Unit: 2143

– col. 8, line 57). MacNaughton does not specifically teach a table of navigation history. Kavner teaches a table of navigation history, (e.g. col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 6 & col. 17, lines 3 – 30). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kavner with MacNaughton because it would be more convenient for users viewing the same web page to view other user's web navigation history that might have view other web sites that pertain to or similar to a topic of a web site that all of the users are viewing or trying to locate. Furthermore, the history of the pages previously accessed could be preloaded to the user as a way to provide a faster load time because it is predicted that the user would likely view the previously accessed web pages when they pertain to the same information currently being view by the user or users.

54. As per claim 12, MacNaughton teaches displaying the indication includes displaying the hypertext link to the second hypertext document in a color associated with the second user, (e.g. col. 8, line 58 – col. 9, line 5).

55. Claim 11 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

56. Applicant's arguments filed 03/30/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2143

57. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 8, 13 – 22 and 25 – 36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

58. In the remarks, Applicant argues in substance that neither references of MacNaughton and Kavner do not teach or disclose the limitations of claim 9, more specifically the teachings of the ability to notify one user of the documents in the navigation history for a different user. Similar arguments are said about claim 11 with reference to MacNaughton and Kavner.

59. As to part 1, the Examiner would like to draw the Applicant's attention to the claim language and specification where there is no specific mention of notifying the first user of the set of hypertext documents in the navigation history for the second user. The Examiner can only find in the specification and drawing where a first user can view a previously viewed, (navigation history), hypertext document from a second user. This does not fall in the scope of the Applicant's claim language disclosed in claim 9. Therefore, as closely and broadly as can be interpreted by the claim language of claim 9, MacNaughton and Kavner teach what is disclosed in claim 9.

60. Claims 11 and 12 are still rejected for similar reasons as disclosed above.

61. Applicant is advised to pay close attention to the possible allowable material that was disclosed in the previous Office Action dated 12/30/2003 and restated above to further the case into a possible allowance.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2143

62. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

63. a. Win et al. U.S. Patent No. 6182142 discloses Distributed access management of information resources.

64. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100